

TIT/HEP-475  
hep-th/0203142  
March, 2002

# Winding number and non-BPS bound states of walls in nonlinear sigma models

Norisuke Sakai <sup>\*</sup> and Ryo Sugisaka <sup>†</sup>

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology  
Tokyo 152-8551, JAPAN*

## Abstract

Non-supersymmetric multi-wall configurations are generically unstable. It is proposed that the stabilization in compact space can be achieved by introducing a winding number into the model. A BPS-like bound is studied for the energy of configuration with nonvanishing winding number. Winding number is implemented in an  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetric nonlinear sigma model with two chiral scalar fields and a bound states of BPS and anti-BPS walls is found to exist in noncompact spaces. Even in compactified space  $S^1$ , this nontrivial bound state persists above a critical radius of the compact dimension.

---

<sup>\*</sup>*e-mail address:* [nsakai@th.phys.titech.ac.jp](mailto:nsakai@th.phys.titech.ac.jp)

<sup>†</sup>*e-mail address:* [sugisaka@th.phys.titech.ac.jp](mailto:sugisaka@th.phys.titech.ac.jp)

# 1 Introduction

Extended objects like walls have attracted much attention recently, mainly because of the possibility of “Brane World” scenario where our four-dimensional spacetime is realized on a wall embedded in a higher dimensional spacetime [1, 2]. Supersymmetry (SUSY) is one of the most promising ideas to solve the hierarchy problem in unified theories [3]. Walls preserving half of the original SUSY [4, 5, 6] are called 1/2 BPS states [7]. Junctions preserving 1/4 of SUSY has also been constructed [8]. An interesting model with two chiral scalar fields has also been found allowing BPS two-wall configurations [9] whose properties are studied with certain Ansatz [10]. By combining the brane-world scenario with SUSY, we have previously proposed a simple mechanism of SUSY breaking due to the coexistence of BPS and anti-BPS walls [11]. We have also invented another model which allows a non-BPS configuration absolutely stable because of the winding number [12].

Motivated by SUSY field theories in spacetime with dimensions higher than four [13]–[14], walls and junctions are studied in nonlinear sigma models with four supercharges [15]. In order to preserve  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SUSY in four dimensions, only holomorphic field redefinitions are allowed. With the holomorphic field redefinitions, one can transform SUSY field theories with minimal kinetic terms (linear sigma models) into those with nonminimal kinetic terms (nonlinear sigma models). The transformations give a model equivalent to the original model as far as local properties in target space are relevant. However, new physical effects can arise if global properties in target space are different. Typical global property of that kind is the winding number in target space [12], [15]. BPS walls in compactified base space has been considered, especially in the context of two dimensional SUSY theories, and the importance of winding number has also been noticed previously [16], [17].

The purpose of this paper is to propose a general method to construct non-BPS configurations by introducing winding number and to study the properties of such non-BPS wall configurations, especially possible non-BPS bound state of walls. We introduce winding number by constructing a nonlinear sigma model. This can be achieved by a holomorphic field redefinition transforming the field variable into an angular variable winding around the target space of nontrivial topology such as  $S^1$ . We obtain a non-BPS configurations consisting of a BPS and an anti-BPS configuration by giving half winding number to each (anti-)BPS configuration. For models with single chiral scalar field with only real parameters, we can establish a BPS-like bound: configurations with nonvanishing winding number consisting of  $n$  (anti-)BPS states has energies larger than or equal to the sum of energies of these  $n$  (anti-)BPS states. Since a superposition of these  $n$  (anti-)BPS states becomes a solution when these BPS states are far apart, our bound implies that no stable

bound state can be formed in this class of models with single chiral scalar field.

Although we do not find exact solutions with nonvanishing winding number, we can still construct an Ansatz of a non-BPS configuration, which is a superposition of BPS and anti-BPS solutions in terms of the periodic variable, to give nonvanishing winding number. This Ansatz is tested in a model with single chiral scalar field and gives a repulsion between a BPS and anti-BPS walls and produces no bound state in accordance with our BPS-like bound. In contrast, a similar Ansatz for configurations without winding number gives an attraction and shows annihilation into the ordinary vacuum.

The model with two chiral scalar fields admits BPS two-wall configurations with a moduli parameter corresponding to the separation of two walls within the BPS state [9]. This internal structure of the BPS state offers a new possibility to form a bound state of BPS and anti-BPS state, whose stability is guaranteed by the nonvanishing winding number. We construct an Ansatz of four walls comprising BPS two walls and another anti-BPS two walls by superposing these solutions in terms of the periodic variable. We find that the BPS-like bound allows a possibility of configurations whose energy is lower than the sum of BPS and anti-BPS states. We evaluate the energy density of the configuration as a function of the moduli and of the distance between BPS and anti-BPS states. We find an interesting nontrivial behavior of the energy density. We first study configurations in noncompact space in order to find a bound state of BPS and anti-BPS states. For one choice of intermediate vacuum, we find an absolute minimum of energy which is lower than the sum of the BPS and anti-BPS states. Although we use a variational Ansatz which is guaranteed to be a solution only in the limit of infinite separation, mere existence of the configurations whose energies are lower than the sum of the BPS and anti-BPS states is sufficient to conclude the existence of the bound state. The distance between BPS and anti-BPS states and the moduli of these states are approximately evaluated using our Ansatz. For another choice of intermediate vacuum, we find a local minimum at vanishing separation between BPS and anti-BPS states. This suggests an unstable bound state at the coincident limit of BPS and anti-BPS states. For compact space, we always find a minimum of energy when the BPS and anti-BPS states are equally spaced. This is due to a tendency to repel each other as indicated by the BPS-like bound. By the same reason, we can expect that the bound state that we find in the other choice of intermediate vacuum may disappear when the radius of the compact dimension is too small. In fact we find that the absolute minimum is gradually raised as the radius decreases, and disappears below a critical radius.

In the next section, a method is given to introduce winding number by a holomorphic field redefinition and a BPS-like bound is derived for models with single chiral scalar field. In section 3, winding number is introduced into a model with two chiral scalar fields. The energy of non-BPS

multi-wall configuration is studied numerically and a bound state of BPS and anti-BPS states is obtained.

## 2 Winding number in SUSY nonlinear sigma models

### 2.1 Introducing the winding number

In order to illustrate our ideas in a simple context, we consider three dimensional domain walls in four-dimensional field theories with four supercharges. A general Wess-Zumino model with an arbitrary number of chiral superfields  $\Phi^i$ , a superpotential  $\mathcal{W}$  and a Kähler potential  $K(\Phi^i, \Phi^{*j})$  is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = K(\Phi^i, \Phi^{*j})\big|_{\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2} + [\mathcal{W}(\Phi^i)\big|_{\theta^2} + \text{h.c.}]. \quad (2.1)$$

We shall denote the scalar component of the superfield  $\Phi^i(x, \theta, \bar{\theta})$  as  $\phi^i(x)$ . Let us suppose that we have a wall configuration which depends only on  $x^2 = y$ . If the following BPS equation is satisfied, two out of the four supercharges are conserved [4, 5, 6]

$$\frac{\partial\phi^i}{\partial y} = K^{ij*} \frac{\partial\mathcal{W}^*(\phi^*)}{\partial\phi^{*j}}. \quad (2.2)$$

We call such a configuration as a BPS wall. The other two supercharges are conserved if the similar equation with opposite sign is satisfied

$$\frac{\partial\phi^i}{\partial y} = -K^{ij*} \frac{\partial\mathcal{W}^*(\phi^*)}{\partial\phi^{*j}}. \quad (2.3)$$

We call such a configuration as an anti-BPS wall. Since these walls connect two supersymmetric vacua, we need models with two vacua at least. Simplest model has a single chiral scalar field  $\Phi$  with a minimal kinetic term and a cubic superpotential  $\mathcal{W}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \Phi^\dagger\Phi\big|_{\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2} + \left[ \left( \frac{m^2}{g}\Phi - \frac{g}{3}\Phi^3 \right) \bigg|_{\theta^2} + \text{h.c.} \right] \\ &= -\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_m} \frac{\partial\phi^*}{\partial x^m} - \left| \frac{m^2}{g} - g\phi^2 \right|^2 + \text{fermions}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The BPS Eq.(2.2) and anti-BPS Eq.(2.3) have solutions

$$\phi_{(\text{wall})}(y) = \frac{m}{g} \tanh(m(y - y_0)), \quad (2.5)$$

$$\phi_{(\text{antiwall})}(y) = -\frac{m}{g} \tanh(m(y - \bar{y}_0)), \quad (2.6)$$

representing walls located at  $y_0$  and  $\bar{y}_0$  respectively. For compact space  $y = y + 2\pi R$ , we have also found an exact solution of wall and anti-wall configuration which breaks supersymmetry completely [11]

$$\phi_{(\text{wall-antiwall})}(y) = \frac{m}{g} \frac{k\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1+k^2}} \text{sn} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1+k^2}} my, k \right), \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\text{sn}(u, k)$  is the Jacobi's elliptic function,  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ , and  $R = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1+k^2}K(k)/(\pi m)$ , where  $K(k)$  is the complete elliptic integral. This non-BPS solution corresponds to a wall located at  $y = 0$  and an anti-wall at  $y = \pi R$ . The small fluctuations around this background exhibit a tachyon corresponding to wall-antiwall annihilation instability [11].

A promising idea to stabilize the non-BPS configuration of two walls is to introduce a topological quantum number, typically a winding number into the model. We give a topology of  $S^1$  to field space so that we can have a notion of winding from a compactified base space which is also  $S^1$ . To achieve that goal, we make a holomorphic redefinition of field  $\phi$  into a periodic one  $\psi$

$$\phi(x) = \frac{m}{g} \sin \psi(x), \quad \Phi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = \frac{m}{g} \sin \Psi(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}). \quad (2.8)$$

In terms of the periodic variable  $\psi$ , the model (2.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{m^2}{g^2} \sin \Psi^\dagger \sin \Psi \Big|_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2} + \frac{m^3}{g^2} \left( \sin \Psi - \frac{1}{3} \sin^3 \Psi \right) \Big|_{\theta^2} + \text{h.c.}, \\ &= -\frac{m^2}{g^2} \left| \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x^m} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi \right|^2 + \text{fermions}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Then the SUSY vacua occurs at  $\psi = \pi \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right)$  with the periodicity  $\psi = \psi + 2\pi$ . The BPS equation (2.2) becomes

$$\frac{d\psi}{dy} = \cos \psi. \quad (2.10)$$

The BPS solution (2.5) is mapped into a solution of this transformed BPS Eq.(2.10)

$$\psi_{(\text{BPS})}(y) = \arcsin(\tanh(m(y - y_0))) \quad (2.11)$$

connecting the SUSY vacuum  $\psi = -\pi/2$  at  $y = -\infty$  to  $\psi = \pi/2$  at  $y = \infty$ . The solution of the anti-BPS equation connecting the SUSY vacuum  $\psi = \pi/2$  at  $y = -\infty$  to  $\psi = 3\pi/2$  at  $y = \infty$  is given by

$$\psi_{(\text{antiBPS})}(y) = \arcsin(\tanh(m(y - \bar{y}_0))) + \pi. \quad (2.12)$$

Since the value of the field  $\psi$  at the right-end of the BPS wall (2.11) is the same as the left-end of the anti-BPS wall (2.12), there is a possibility to connect these two wall solutions located at  $y_0 < \bar{y}_0$ . Such a field configuration should have winding number one.

In fact we have found previously that a similar model with the minimal kinetic term provides the same BPS equation (2.10) and that there is an exact solution for the non-BPS configuration of two walls for compactified space  $y$  [12]. The configuration was found to wind around the field space  $\psi$  once and is topologically stable.<sup>1</sup>

In our model with the periodic variable (2.9) we have an exact solution for compactified space

$$\psi_{(\text{wall-antiwall})}(y) = \arcsin \left( \frac{m}{g} \frac{k\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1+k^2}} \operatorname{sn} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1+k^2}} my, k \right) \right), \quad (2.13)$$

obtained by transforming the non-BPS solution (2.7) to our periodic variable  $\psi$ . Since  $0 < \frac{k\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1+k^2}} < 1$  for  $0 < k < 1$ , the configuration has no winding number and represents the wall-antiwall configuration as in our original model without periodic variable [11]. One also finds that the small fluctuation around the background has exactly the same spectrum including the tachyon instability. This is consistent with the fact that ordinary vacuum is the minimum energy configuration in the vanishing winding number sector.

## 2.2 BPS-like bound for winding field configuration

We are interested in the field configuration with a nonvanishing winding number. Let us consider a BPS-like bound for the energy of the configuration with a nonvanishing winding number. Let us first consider the model (2.9) as the simplest model for illustration. If there is a field configuration with unit winding number,  $\psi$  should rotate by  $2\pi$  as  $y$  increases by  $2\pi R$ . The noncompact space is obtained by the limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . Let us call the point  $y_1$  where  $\psi = -\pi/2$  and  $y_2$  where  $\psi = \pi/2$  and assume  $y_1 < y_2$  as illustrated in Fig. 1. The energy of a configuration with one winding number is given in one periodicity domain by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \int_{y_1}^{y_1+2\pi R} dy \left[ \frac{m^2}{g^2} \left| \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \int_{y_1}^{y_2} dy \left[ \left| \frac{m}{g} \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} - \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi \right|^2 + \frac{m^3}{g^2} \frac{d}{dy} \left( \sin \psi - \frac{1}{3} \sin^3 \psi \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \int_{y_2}^{y_1+2\pi R} dy \left[ \left| \frac{m}{g} \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} + \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi \right|^2 - \frac{m^3}{g^2} \frac{d}{dy} \left( \sin \psi - \frac{1}{3} \sin^3 \psi \right) \right] \\ &\geq \left[ \frac{m^3}{g^2} \left( \sin \psi - \frac{1}{3} \sin^3 \psi \right) \right]_{y_1}^{y_2} - \left[ \frac{m^3}{g^2} \left( \sin \psi - \frac{1}{3} \sin^3 \psi \right) \right]_{y_2}^{y_1+2\pi R} = 2E_{\text{BPS}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Since the 1/2-BPS solution is real, we can reinterpret the inverse of the Kähler metric  $K^{ij*}$  as a part of the derivative of a superpotential  $K^{ij*} \partial \mathcal{W} / \partial \phi^{*j} = \partial \tilde{\mathcal{W}} / \partial \phi^{*j}$ , as noted in [15].




Figure 1: The profile of the field configuration of  $\psi$  with unit winding number. The dotted lines  $\psi = -\pi/2$  and  $\psi = 3\pi/2$  should be identified.

where  $E_{\text{BPS}}$  is the energy of the single BPS or anti-BPS wall. Therefore any configuration with unit winding number has energy larger than or equal to the sum of energies of a BPS wall and an anti-BPS wall. Since this superposition of the BPS and anti-BPS states becomes a solution of equation of motion as their separation goes to infinity, we find that BPS state and anti-BPS state in unit winding number sector always repel each other as they are sufficiently far apart at least. Whether there is any local minimum for finite separation or not is the remaining question which we will address in the next subsection.

This BPS-like bound can also be generalized to other models of a single chiral scalar field using arbitrary superpotential with real parameters. This may be achieved if the parameters of the model can be made real by phase rotations of the fields. Then we can assume that the field configuration is real. Let us suppose that there are two vacua at  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  of the periodic variable  $\psi = \psi + 2\pi$ . Without loss of generality we can assume  $\mathcal{W}(\psi_1) < \mathcal{W}(\psi_2)$ . If there is field configuration with a single winding number which takes value  $\psi_1$  at  $y_1$ , and  $\psi_2$  at  $y_2$ , we can apply a BPS bound for the interval  $y_1 < y < y_2$  and anti-BPS bound for the interval  $y_2 < y < y_1 + 2\pi R$  as in Eq.(2.14). Thus we obtain the energy of the field configuration with single winding number is bounded by  $2E_{\text{BPS}} = 2(\mathcal{W}(\psi_2) - \mathcal{W}(\psi_1))$ . Similarly we can easily find that winding field configurations consisting of  $n$  (anti-)BPS states in one periodicity domain  $0 \leq y \leq 2\pi R$  have energy larger than or equal to the sum of these BPS states.

## 2.3 Repulsion between BPS and anti-BPS walls

Since we cannot find exact solutions in the sector with nonvanishing winding number, we shall use approximate evaluation of the possible configurations inspired by the BPS (2.11) and anti-BPS (2.12) solutions. This is at least sufficient to give an upper bound of the energy of the possible minimum energy solution from the viewpoint of a variational approach.

Let us consider a superposition of the BPS wall solution (2.11) centered at  $y = 0$  and the anti-BPS solution (2.12) centered at  $y = a$

$$\psi(y) = \arcsin(\tanh(my)) + \arcsin(\tanh(m(y-a))) + \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (2.15)$$

connecting the SUSY vacuum  $\psi = -\pi/2$  at  $y = -\infty$  to  $\psi = 3\pi/2$  at  $y = \infty$ , and has unit winding number. Although this is not a static solution of the equation of motion for finite separation  $a$ , it reduces to a solution in the limit  $a \rightarrow \infty$ . Defining a dimensionless coordinate

$$u \equiv my, \quad u_a \equiv ma, \quad (2.16)$$

the energy of this configuration is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \left[ \frac{m^2}{g^2} \left| \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{m^3}{g^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du \left[ \left( \frac{\tanh u}{\cosh(u-u_a)} + \frac{\tanh(u-u_a)}{\cosh u} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{\cosh u} + \frac{1}{\cosh(u-u_a)} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{\tanh u}{\cosh(u-u_a)} + \frac{\tanh(u-u_a)}{\cosh u} \right)^4 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

A typical field configuration at  $u_a = ma = 10$  in Fig. 2a shows  $\psi$  winding once to form two walls. Even at the coincident limit  $a \rightarrow 0$  of two walls, field configuration is nontrivial as shown in Fig. 2b. The energy as a function of the wall separation  $a$  is shown in Fig. 3, where the parameters are set to  $m = 1$ ,  $g = 1$ . We see that the energy is always larger than the sum of the isolated wall and anti-wall and reduces to the sum at  $a \rightarrow \infty$  in accordance with our BPS-like bound. Therefore we find that BPS wall and anti-BPS wall repel each other and have no stable bound state in the unit winding number sector.

To examine how well our Ansatz carries the correct behavior of the lowest energy configuration, we also compute the energy of the corresponding Ansatz in vanishing winding number sector:

$$\psi_{\text{no winding}}(y) = \arcsin(\tanh(my)) - \arcsin(\tanh(m(y-a))) - \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (2.18)$$






Figure 2: The profile of  $\psi$  with unit winding number, the superposition of the BPS wall and the anti-BPS wall at  $ma = 10$  (a) and  $ma = 0$  (b).




Figure 3: The energy of  $\psi$  as a function of the wall separation  $a$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{\text{no winding}} = & \frac{m^3}{g^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du \left[ \left( \frac{\tanh u}{\cosh(u - u_a)} - \frac{\tanh(u - u_a)}{\cosh u} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{\cosh u} - \frac{1}{\cosh(u - u_a)} \right)^2 \right. \\
 & \left. + \left( \frac{\tanh u}{\cosh(u - u_a)} - \frac{\tanh(u - u_a)}{\cosh u} \right)^4 \right]. \quad (2.19)
 \end{aligned}$$

A typical field configuration at  $u_a = 10$  in Fig. 4a shows no winding to be compared with Fig. 2a. At the coincident limit  $a \rightarrow 0$  of two walls, the field  $\psi$  becomes constant as shown in Fig. 4b and reduces to the ordinary vacuum  $\psi = -\pi/2$  in contrast to the unit winding number case in Fig. 2b. In Fig. 5 we show the energy of the two wall configuration in the vanishing winding number sector as a function of the wall separation  $a$ . It reduces to the sum of the BPS energies of two walls at  $a \rightarrow \pm\infty$  and vanishes at the coincident point  $a = 0$ . This clearly shows that the wall-antiwall configuration in the zero winding number sector is unstable and annihilates into the vacuum.




Figure 4: The profile of  $\psi_{\text{no winding}}$  without winding number, the superposition of the BPS wall and the anti-BPS wall at  $ma = 10$  (a) and  $ma = 0$  (b).




Figure 5: The energy of  $\psi_{\text{no winding}}$  as a function of the wall separation  $a$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

### 3 Winding number in a model with two fields

#### 3.1 Model with two fields

In order to explore a nontrivial behavior of winding number configuration, we consider the next simplest possibility, models with two chiral scalar fields. It has been found that the model with minimal kinetic terms for chiral scalar fields  $\Phi$  and  $X$  with the following superpotential  $\mathcal{W}$  has an integral of motion [9]

$$\mathcal{W}(\Phi, X) = \frac{m^2}{g}\Phi - \frac{g}{3}\Phi^3 - \frac{g}{4}\Phi X^2, \quad m, g > 0. \quad (3.1)$$

This model is the simplest modification of our model in Eq.(2.4) in the previous section to allow four degenerate SUSY vacua at  $(\phi, \chi) = (\pm \frac{m}{g}, 0), (0, \pm 2\frac{m}{g})$ . There are BPS wall solutions connecting the vacuum  $(-\frac{m}{g}, 0)$  to  $(0, \pm 2\frac{m}{g})$  and solution  $(0, \pm 2\frac{m}{g})$  to  $(\frac{m}{g}, 0)$ . Since both of them turn out to conserve the same supercharge, the smooth connection of these wall solutions located far apart should be a solution of the same BPS equation. A remarkable property of this model

is that it admits a BPS solution of two walls connecting  $(\phi, \chi) = (-\frac{m}{g}, 0)$  to  $(\frac{m}{g}, 0)$

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= \frac{m}{g}f(u), & f(u) &= \frac{\sinh u}{\cosh u + t}, \\ \chi &= \pm \frac{m}{g}h(u), & h(u) &= 2\sqrt{\frac{t}{\cosh u + t}},\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

where  $0 \leq t$  is a moduli parameter [9, 10]. This configuration can be interpreted as a smooth connection of the above two BPS walls connecting between  $(-\frac{m}{g}, 0)$  and  $(0, \pm 2\frac{m}{g})$  and between  $(0, \pm 2\frac{m}{g})$  to  $(\frac{m}{g}, 0)$ . They are centered at  $y = 0$ . If the moduli parameter  $t$  is larger than one, these two walls are separated by a distance  $y = \hat{t}$  where  $\cosh(m\hat{t}) = t$ . The case with  $0 \leq t < 1$  corresponds to two walls compressed each other so that the walls merge together completely.

We introduce the concept of winding number by making a holomorphic change of variable (2.8) from  $\phi$  to a periodic one  $\psi = \arcsin(g\phi/m)$ . The bosonic part of our model with the periodic variable is then given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{bosonic}} = -\frac{m^2}{g^2} \left| \cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x^m} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial x^m} \right|^2 - \left| \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi - \frac{g}{4} \chi^2 \right|^2 - \left| -\frac{m}{2} \chi \sin \psi \right|^2.\tag{3.3}$$

The vacua of this model are at

$$(\psi, \chi) = \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + n\pi, 0 \right), \quad \left( n\pi, \frac{2m}{g} \right), \quad \left( n\pi, -\frac{2m}{g} \right),\tag{3.4}$$

with integer  $-\infty < n < \infty$ . The BPS equation is given by

$$\cos \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u} = \cos^2 \psi^* - \frac{g^2}{4m^2} \chi^{*2}, \quad \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial u} = -\frac{1}{2} \sin \psi^* \chi^*, \quad u \equiv my.\tag{3.5}$$

One can obtain from (3.2) a BPS two-wall solution which connects  $(\psi, \chi) = (-\pi/2, 0)$  at  $y = -\infty$  to  $(\psi, \chi) = (\pi/2, 0)$  at  $y = \infty$

$$\psi_{\text{BPS}} = \arcsin(f(u)), \quad \chi_{\text{BPS}}^\pm = \pm \frac{m}{g}h(u),\tag{3.6}$$

where the functions  $f(u), h(u)$  are defined in (3.2). The  $\pm$  of  $\chi^\pm$  corresponds to the sign of vacuum  $(\psi, \chi) = (0, \pm 2m/g)$  in the intermediate region. Another two wall configuration connecting  $(\psi, \chi) = (\pi/2, 0)$  at  $y = -\infty$  to  $(\psi, \chi) = (3\pi/2, 0)$  at  $y = \infty$  is given as a solution of anti-BPS equation preserving the opposite combination of supercharges

$$\psi_{\text{antiBPS}} = \arcsin(f(u)) + \pi, \quad \chi_{\text{antiBPS}}^\pm = \pm \frac{m}{g}h(u).\tag{3.7}$$

These solutions are centered at  $y = 0$  and have a moduli  $t$ .




Figure 6: The profile of the field configuration of  $\psi_{\text{nonBPS}}$ .




Figure 7: The profile of the field configuration of  $\chi_{\text{nonBPS}}^{\pm}$ .

We can construct an Ansatz for the configuration with unit winding number by superposing the BPS two-wall solution with the moduli  $t_1$  centered at  $y = 0$  and the anti-BPS two wall solution with the moduli  $t_2$  centered at  $y = a$

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{nonBPS}} &= \arcsin\left(\frac{\sinh u}{\cosh u + t_1}\right) + \arcsin\left(\frac{\sinh(u - u_a)}{\cosh(u - u_a) + t_2}\right) + \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ \chi_{\text{nonBPS}}^{\pm} &= \frac{2m}{g} \left( \sqrt{\frac{t_1}{\cosh u + t_1}} \pm \sqrt{\frac{t_2}{\cosh(u - u_a) + t_2}} \right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.8}$$

where the sign  $\pm$  for the field  $\chi^{\pm}$  indicates the same (+) or opposite (−) sign of vacuum in the intermediate region around  $y = 0$  and around  $y = a$ . A typical field configuration  $(\psi, \chi^+)$  is illustrated in Figs. 6 and 7a. We have shown the distance  $\hat{t}_i \equiv \text{arccosh}(t_i)/m$  between walls within the BPS state ( $i = 1$ ) and the anti-BPS state ( $i = 2$ ). For comparison, field configuration  $(\psi, \chi^-)$  for the vacuum  $(\psi, \chi) = (0, -2m/g)$  in the intermediate region is illustrated in Figs. 6 and 7b.

### 3.2 BPS-like bound for two fields model

Let us first examine what sort of BPS-like bound can be obtained in the case of two fields. The energy in the one periodicity domain is given by

$$E = \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \left[ \left| \frac{m}{g} \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{dy} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{d\chi}{dy} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi - \frac{g}{4} \chi^2 \right|^2 + \left| -\frac{m}{2} \chi \sin \psi \right|^2 \right]. \quad (3.9)$$

Similarly to the single field model, we assume that the periodic field  $\psi$  takes values  $-\pi/2$  at  $y_1$  and  $\pi/2$  at  $y_2$ . We find

$$\begin{aligned} E = & \int_{y_1}^{y_2} dy \left[ \left| \frac{m}{g} \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{dy} - \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi + \frac{g}{4} \chi^2 \right|^2 + \left| \frac{d\chi}{dy} + \frac{m}{2} \chi \sin \psi \right|^2 + \frac{d\mathcal{W}(\psi, \chi)}{dy} \right] \\ & + \int_{y_2}^{y_1+2\pi R} dy \left[ \left| \frac{m}{g} \cos \psi \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial y} + \frac{m^2}{g} \cos^2 \psi - \frac{g}{4} \chi^2 \right|^2 + \left| \frac{d\chi}{dy} - \frac{m}{2} \chi \sin \psi \right|^2 - \frac{d\mathcal{W}(\psi, \chi)}{dy} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

In the case of single field model, one can specify the value of the superpotential in terms of the value of the field  $\psi$ . Combined with the requirement of nonvanishing winding number and the continuity of a real function  $\psi(y)$ , we are sure that the superpotential has to reach the vacuum value  $\mathcal{W}(\psi = \pi/2)$  before returning back to the original value  $\mathcal{W}(\psi = -\pi/2)$  as dictated by the periodicity of the superpotential in our model. This is the origin of the BPS-like bound for the single field model. In the case of two fields, however, the above bound reads

$$\begin{aligned} E & \geq 2 \left[ \mathcal{W} \left( \psi(y_2) = \frac{\pi}{2}, \chi(y_2) \right) - \mathcal{W} \left( \psi(y_1) = \frac{-\pi}{2}, \chi(y_1) \right) \right] \\ & = 2 \left[ \left( \frac{2m^3}{3g^2} - \frac{m}{4} \chi^2(y_2) \right) - \left( -\frac{2m^3}{3g^2} + \frac{m}{4} \chi^2(y_1) \right) \right] \\ & = 2E_{\text{BPS}} - \frac{m}{2} (\chi^2(y_2) + \chi^2(y_1)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Nonvanishing  $\chi(y_1)$  and  $\chi(y_2)$  make this bound lower than twice the BPS energy. In the case of two fields, it is not guaranteed for two fields to take particular value specified by the vacuum at the same time. Consequently the superpotential need not reach the value at the vacuum before returning back to its original value. Since we have just chosen particular points  $y_1, y_2$  to divide the integration region to evaluate the BPS or anti-BPS bound, it is possible that we can have better bound by choosing other point of division. However, it does not seem to be possible to choose such a point in general situations. Therefore we just conclude that the energy of the winding configuration need not be larger than the sum of BPS and anti-BPS states. This result suggests that there is a possibility for a non-BPS bound state of walls in the case of the two-wall model.

### 3.3 Non-BPS multi-walls in the noncompact space

Here we present energy (3.9) of the non-BPS configuration of four walls with unit winding number (3.8). To avoid too many parameters, we will use the same moduli parameters for both BPS and anti-BPS states  $t_1 = t_2 \equiv t$  except stated otherwise.

For the case of  $\chi^\pm$  with the same sign of the field  $\chi$  for BPS and anti-BPS walls, we show the energy as a function of separation  $a$  between BPS and anti-BPS walls, for fixed moduli  $t$  in Fig. 8. A typical field configuration can be obtained by letting  $\hat{t}_1 = \hat{t}_2$  in Figs. 6 and 7a. We observe the following:

1. There exist configurations which have energies lower than the sum of BPS and anti-BPS states in contrast to the single field case. Although we have only a limited Ansatz of field configurations inspired by physical considerations, this fact clearly shows that the BPS and anti-BPS states infinitely far apart is not the lowest energy state in the nonvanishing winding number sector.
2. Among these configurations, we find the minimum energy configuration which has a separation  $a \approx 4.73/m$  of BPS and anti-BPS states and the moduli  $t \approx 0.200$  which is shown in Fig.8. Thus we find an approximate evaluation of the minimum energy configuration for the unit winding number sector.
3. We have also examined the energy as a function of the difference  $t_1 - t_2$  between the moduli parameters of the BPS state  $t_1$  and the anti-BPS state  $t_2$  as shown in Fig. 9. It shows clearly the configuration achieves the minimum energy for  $t_1 = t_2$ .
4. Therefore we find that there exists a non-BPS bound state of walls whose approximate configuration is given by BPS and anti-BPS two walls with moduli parameter  $t_1 = t_2 \approx 0.200$  which are separated by  $a \approx 4.73/m$ .




Figure 8: The energy of the field configuration of  $(\psi, \chi^\pm)$  as a function of  $a$  at  $t = 0.2$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).




Figure 9: The energy of  $(\psi, \chi^+)$  as a function of  $t_1 - t_2$  at  $(t_1 + t_2)/2 = 0.2$  and  $ma = 4.73$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

For the case with the opposite sign of the fields  $\chi$  for BPS and anti-BPS walls, we show the energy as a function of separation  $a$  between BPS and anti-BPS walls, for fixed moduli  $t \approx 0.423$  in Fig. 10. A typical field configuration can be obtained by letting  $\hat{t}_1 = \hat{t}_2$  in Figs. 6 and 7b). We observe the following:

1. We find that energy is always higher than the sum of the BPS and anti-BPS states.
2. There exists a local minimum of energy at zero separation  $a = 0$  between BPS and anti-BPS states for the moduli parameter  $t < 3.705$ . The lowest value of this local minimum occurs at the moduli  $t \approx 0.423$  which is shown in Fig. 10.




Figure 10: The energy of the field configuration of  $(\psi, \chi^-)$  as a function of  $a$  at  $t = 0.423$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

### 3.4 Non-BPS multi-walls in compactified space

It is interesting to examine if the above non-BPS bound state of walls persists when the space is compactified on  $S^1$ , since one expects a repulsion from the other walls located at  $2\pi R$  which is

the periodicity of the base space  $y = y + 2\pi R$ .

When the space is compactified, the BPS states are placed at  $y = 2n\pi R$  and anti-BPS walls at  $y = 2n\pi R + a$  periodically. Then we have an Ansatz

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{nonBPS}} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} [\arcsin(f(u - 2nu_0)) + \arcsin(f(u - u_a - 2nu_0)) + \pi] - \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ \chi_{\text{nonBPS}}^{\pm} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{m}{g} (h(u - 2nu_0) \pm h(u - u_a - 2nu_0)) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

where  $u \equiv my, u_a \equiv ma, u_0 \equiv m\pi R$ .

In one periodicity domain  $a - \pi R < y < a + \pi R$ , only nearby walls are important. Three walls (placed at  $y = 0, a, 2\pi R$ ) and five walls (placed at  $y = a - 2\pi R, 0, a, 2\pi R, a + 2\pi R$ ) approximations of energy in an interval  $a - \pi R < y < a + \pi R$  are compared in the case of the moduli parameter  $t = 0$ . We find an excellent agreement between three wall and five wall approximations. We show the fractional difference  $(E_5 - E_3)/E_3$  between energies in compact space in approximations with five walls  $E_5$  and three walls  $E_3$  in Table. 1. Therefore we choose to use three wall approximation in the following. The energy density in Eq.(3.9) can be evaluated in the three wall approximation by using the  $f_i = f(u_i), h_i = h(u_i), i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $u_1 = u, u_2 = u - u_a, u_3 = u - 2m\pi R$

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \psi &= -f_1 \sqrt{(1 - f_2^2)(1 - f_3^2)} - f_2 \sqrt{(1 - f_3^2)(1 - f_1^2)} - f_3 \sqrt{(1 - f_1^2)(1 - f_2^2)} + f_1 f_2 f_3, \\ \cos \psi &= -\sqrt{(1 - f_1^2)(1 - f_2^2)(1 - f_3^2)} + f_1 f_2 \sqrt{(1 - f_3^2)} + f_2 f_3 \sqrt{(1 - f_1^2)} + f_3 f_1 \sqrt{(1 - f_2^2)}, \\ \frac{d\psi}{du} &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{\sqrt{(e^{u_i} + t)(e^{-u_i} + t)}} \frac{t \cosh u_i + 1}{\cosh u_i + t}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

$2m\pi R$	10	20	40
$a = 0, 2\pi R$	$9.18 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.12 \times 10^{-9}$	$\ll 10^{-9}$
$a = \pi R$	$1.03 \times 10^{-2}$	$6.81 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.09 \times 10^{-9}$

Table 1: Fractional difference  $(E_5 - E_3)/E_3$  between energies in compact space in approximations with five walls  $E_5$  and three walls  $E_3$  for  $2m\pi R = 10, 20, 40$ . Difference is largest for anti-wall placed at the center of periodicity  $a = \pi R$ , and smallest at coincident limit  $a = 0, 2\pi R$ .



For the choice of same sign of  $\chi$  for BPS and anti-BPS states, a typical field configuration  $\psi$  and  $\chi^+$  is shown in Fig. 11 for  $2m\pi R = 40$  and  $t = 0.2$  choosing  $a = \pi R$ . The corresponding energy of the unit winding number configuration is shown in Fig. 12a as a function of  $ma$ . We find that there is an absolute minimum at  $ma = 4.75$  which is identical to the noncompact case. We also find a very shallow local minimum at the center  $a = \pi R$ . This comes about because of the compactification. General tendency of the non-BPS walls is that they exert repulsion as we have encountered in the single field case. This repulsion produces a minimum at the central position.

As we decrease the compactification radius  $R$ , the absolute minimum gets shallower as shown in Fig. 12b for the case of  $2m\pi R = 20$  with the same moduli  $t = 0.2$ . Eventually the absolute minimum around  $ma = 4.75$  disappears and we obtain only single minimum at the center  $a = \pi R$ . Thus we find that the non-BPS bound state of walls persists for larger values of compactification radius up to  $2m\pi R < 16.92$ , and that it becomes unstable for smaller values of the radius.




Figure 11: The profile of the field configuration of  $(\psi, \chi^+)$  in three wall approximation at  $2m\pi R = 40$  and  $t = 0.2$  ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).




Figure 12: The energy of  $(\psi, \chi^+)$  as a function of  $ma$  at  $t = 0.2$  in the case of  $2m\pi R = 40$  (a) and  $2m\pi R = 20$  (b) ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

Let us next examine the case with the opposite sign of the fields  $\chi$  for BPS and anti-BPS

walls. A typical field configuration  $\psi$  and  $\chi^-$  is shown in Fig. 13 for  $2m\pi R = 40$  and  $t = 0.423$  choosing  $a = \pi R$ . For noncompact space, we have found a local minimum of energies at  $a = 0$ . This still persists for  $2m\pi R = 40$  and  $2m\pi R = 10$  as shown in Fig. 14. The absolute minimum always occurs at the center  $a = \pi R$  in the case of the opposite sign of the fields  $\chi$  for BPS and anti-BPS walls. Since the width of the BPS state is of order  $1/m$ , our Ansatz requires  $my$  to span a region of a few times  $1/m$  for the field  $\psi$  to make a full  $2\pi$  winding. Therefore we should not trust our Ansatz for too small values of radius  $R$ .




Figure 13: The profile of the field configuration of  $(\psi, \chi^-)$  in three wall approximation at  $2m\pi R = 40$  and  $t = 0.423$ .




Figure 14: The energy of  $(\psi, \chi^-)$  as a function of  $ma$  at  $t = 0.423$  in the case of  $2m\pi R = 40$  (a) and  $2m\pi R = 10$  (b) ( $m = 1, g = 1$ ).

## Acknowledgments

We thank Nobuhito Maru and Yutaka Sakamura for a collaboration of previous works where an idea of this work arises. This work is supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan, priority area

(#707) “Supersymmetry and unified theory of elementary particles” and No.13640269. R.S. is supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for Young Scientists (No.6665).

## References

- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B429** (1998) 263 [hep-ph/9803315]; I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B436** (1998) 257 [hep-ph/9804398].
- [2] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3370 [hep-ph/9905221]; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 4690 [hep-th/9906064].
- [3] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B193** (1981) 150; N. Sakai, *Z. f. Phys.* **C11** (1981) 153; E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B188** (1981) 513; S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby, and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev.* **D24** (1981) 1681.
- [4] M. Cvetič, S. Griffies and S. Rey, *Nucl. Phys.* **B381** (1992) 301 [hep-th/9201007].
- [5] G. Dvali and M. Shifman, *Phys. Lett.* **B396** (1997) 64 [hep-th/9612128]; *Nucl. Phys.* **B504** (1997) 127 [hep-th/9611213].
- [6] A. Kovner, M. Shifman, and A. Smilga, *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 7978 [hep-th/9706089]; A. Smilga and A. Veselov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 4529 [hep-th/9706217]; V. Kaplunovsky, J. Sonnenschein, and S. Yankielowicz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B552** (1999) 209 [hep-th/9811195]; B. de Carlos and J. M. Moreno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 2120 [hep-th/9905165]; J. Edelstein, M.L. Trobo, F. Brito and D. Bazeia, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 7561 [hep-th/9707016].
- [7] E. Witten and D. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **B78** (1978) 97.
- [8] H. Oda, K. Ito, M. Naganuma and N. Sakai, *Phys. Lett.* **B471** (1999) 148 [hep-th/9910095]; K. Ito, M. Naganuma, H. Oda and N. Sakai, *Nucl. Phys.* **B586** (2000) 231 [hep-th/0004188]; *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* 101 (2001) 304 [hep-th/0012182].
- [9] M. Shifman and M.B. Voloshin, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 2590 [hep-th/9709137]; M.B. Voloshin, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 1266 [hep-th/9708067].
- [10] S.V. Troitsky and M.B. Voloshin, *Phys. Lett.* **B449** (1999) 17 [hep-th/9812116]; V.A. Gani and A.E. Kudryavtsev, “Non-BPS domain wall configurations in a supersymmetric model” [hep-th/9912211].

- [11] N. Maru, N. Sakai, Y. Sakamura, and R. Sugisaka, *Phys. Lett.* **B496** (2000) 98 [hep-th/0009023].
- [12] N. Maru, N. Sakai, Y. Sakamura, and R. Sugisaka, *Nucl. Phys.* **B616** (2001) 47 [hep-th/0107204]; N. Maru, N. Sakai, Y. Sakamura, and R. Sugisaka, the Proceedings of the 10th Tohwa international symposium on string theory, American Institute of Physics, 607, pages 209-215, (2002) [hep-th/0109087]; “SUSY Breaking by stable non-BPS configurations”, to appear in the Proceedings of the Corfu Summer Institute on Elementary particle Physics, Corfu, September 2001 [hep-th/0112244].
- [13] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and D.Z. Freedman, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **91** (1983) 87; E.R.C. Abraham and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B291** (1992) 85; *ibid.* **B295** (1992) 225.
- [14] J.P. Gauntlet, D. Tong and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 085001 [hep-th/0007124]; J.P. Gauntlet, R. Portugues, D. Tong and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 085002 [hep-th/0008221]; J.P. Gauntlet, D. Tong and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 25010 [hep-th/0107228]; M. Naganuma, M. Nitta, and N. Sakai, “BPS lumps and their intersections in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SUSY nonlinear sigma models” to appear in G@C , special issue devoted to Quantum Gravity, Unified Models and Strings to mark 100th anniversary of Tomsk State Pedagogical University, [hep-th/0108133].
- [15] M. Naganuma, M. Nitta, and N. Sakai, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 045016-1, [hep-th/0108179].
- [16] X. Hou, A. Losev, and M. Shifman, *Phys. Rev.* **D61** (2000) 085005 [hep-th/9910071].
- [17] R. Hofmann and T. ter Veldhuis, *Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 025017 [hep-th/0006077]; Ralf Hofmann, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 065012 [hep-th/0004178].